ECCLESIA LAW

THE STRAWMAN IDEOLOGY ARE YOU AVOIDING THE TRAP WITH ADVANCED MONOPOLY

3RD MARCH 2026

The contemporary legal and financial landscape operates upon a fundamental, often invisible, bifurcation between biological reality and juridical construction.[1] This division is not merely a procedural nuance but the very ontological bedrock upon which the entire edifice of civil governance and global commerce rests.[1] Within the "sovereign" and "freedom" communities, this phenomenon is primarily understood through the lens of the "strawman theory," a belief system that posits the existence of a dual identity for every individual: a living, breathing natural man or woman and an artificial, state-created legal entity.[1] This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the strawman construct, examining its alleged origins, the mechanics of its creation via birth registration, the jurisdictional traps inherent in presumed agency, and the advanced commercial solutions proposed to navigate this system by "playing Monopoly to win".[1]

The Anatomy of the Strawman Illusion and Juridical Personhood

The core of the strawman theory is the claim that a person's legal responsibilities belong to an artificial legal personality—the strawman—rather than the physical individual.[2] Proponents argue that the strawman is the method by which natural beings "interface" with the commercial world and the government.[1] Without this interface, it is claimed that the natural being would be unable to obtain identification or interact commercially.[1] The legal system, by its very nature, does not interact with biological matter; it interacts only with "persons," which is a "term of art" meticulously defined by statute to act as an interface layer between the state and the subject.[1] This distinction is critical for determining liability, as jurisdictional questions depend on identifying whether a defendant is being sued in their personal capacity as a natural person or their representative capacity as an agent for an artificial person.[1]

Defining the Juridical Persona

The strawman is frequently defined as a "public office" and a "fiction of law".[1] It is characterized as a state-created office of "person" that serves as the "clothes" for a public officer.[1] In this framework, the strawman is the only lawful subject of civil legislation or civil enforcement.[1] The distinction between the biological and the legal is often signalled through naming conventions. Bibi Bacus, a prominent figure in this movement, defines the strawman simply as the individual's name written in all block letters, such as JOHN HENRY DOE.[1]

This all-caps version is referred to as the "Glossa" or the "fictional person," which is distinct from the natural person's name written in proper case, such as John-Henry: Doe.[3]

The Strawman's primary function is as a creation of the state and a means to extract energy and labour during an individual's life to keep the state's fiction alive.[1] The fiction is often described as a parasite that lives off the energy of living humans.[1] Because the living cannot speak to the dead, the government requires a medium; hence, the "person" is created, and individuals ignorantly agree to become the surety for it.[1] This process is known as an "enjoinder," a term describing the link between the natural man and the legal fiction.[1]

The Evolution and Historical Narrative of the Movement

The strawman theory is a central component of what researchers call the "Pseudo-law Memeplex".[2] Its origins can be traced to a combination of the Tax Protester movement, the Posse Comitatus, the Patriot movement, and the Redemption/A4V movement.[4] While the Posse Comitatus focused on local authority and "natural rights" in the 1970s, the specific strawman theory became well-established by 2000, providing an overarching explanation for various anti-government beliefs.[5]

Adherents believe that shortly after the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1870, the United States government was quietly transformed into a corporation by corrupt bankers, subjecting the American people to an entirely new set of commercial laws.[6] These laws usurped the Constitution and overturned its protections.[6] This corporation is often referred to as the de facto government and is seen as illegitimate.[6] Most sovereigns make a distinction between "common law citizens" governed under the original Constitution and "Fourteenth Amendment citizens" governed under the U.S. Code or commercial law, and thus subject to the rules of the United States corporation.[6]

Identity Component	Standard Commercial Perception	Advanced Monopoly Capacity
Name Format	Proper Case Name (John Doe)	Glossa / All-Caps Name (JOHN DOE)
Legal Nature	Biological / Natural Person	Artificial / Juridical Person
Governing Law	Common Law / Natural Law	Statutory / UCC / Admiralty
Primary Status	Sovereign / Principal	Debtor / Agent / Public Office
Signature Type	Autograph (Evidence of Life)	Signature (Endorsement of Fiction)

Financial Role	Creditor (Source of Energy)	Debtor (Vessel for Liabilities)

The Mechanics of the Birth Certificate Construct

The registration of a birth is viewed by sovereign theorists as the moment the strawman is created.[2] The "birth certificate construct" is functionally a "body of persons" or a statutory trust.[1] Upon the registration of a birth, the state creates an artificial entity—a "legal personality"—that is distinct from the child whose birth occasioned its creation.[1] Proponents like Bibi Bacus argue that when a mother registers a child's birth at a registration office, she acts as an "informant," and the state then creates a duplicate "dead entity" birth certificate in block letters, turning the living child into a fictional trust.[1]

Securitization and the Secret Treasury Account

A prevalent belief is that each person's birth certificate is converted into a "bond" or a "warehouse bond for money".[1] This trust is alleged to have a specific value allocated to it—often cited as millions of dollars or weight in gold—which is then traded on the stock market by entities such as the Federal Reserve, the IRS, or the Crown without the individual's knowledge.[3] This is the Child's Birth Certificate Bond Funds amount held by the government in a reserve account investment trust that banks draw against when the individual signs a promissory note.[1]

The theory posits that the government is essentially bankrupt and uses these secret accounts as collateral to continue to trade with other countries.[3] Every individual is believed to have a CUSIP number covering their hidden money and U.S. currency in a Government Stock Market funds account.[1] This number allows stock to be tracked on the stock market, and it is pooled with other numbers to be traded under the name of the institution as a securities exchange.[1]

The Cestui Que Vie Trust and Maritime Metaphor

In many variations of the theory, this secret account is identified as a "Cestui Que Vie (CQV) Trust".[2] The justification for this trust is rooted in the claim that the state has "presumed" the living man to be lost at sea or incompetent, thereby allowing the state to probate the estate in his absence.[1] The biological human is the "Living Player," while the all-capitalized name (the "Strawman") is a fictional corporate persona.[1]

A comparison is often drawn between shipping and childbirth.[1] A pregnant woman, laden with her "cargo," arrives at the "dock" (the hospital).[1] The child is "delivered" and comes through the "birth canal" (berth canal), resulting in a "birth certificate" (berth certificate), which serves as a warehouse receipt for the cargo.[1] The "Artificial You" is a separate legal person that can own property and incur debt, but because it has no

hands to sign checks and no voice to answer a judge, it requires a representative.[1] The system relies on the living man to fill this role.[1]

Monetized Signatures and the Credit Energy Theory

The distinction between the living man and the strawman is further reinforced through the theory of "credit energy".[1] The commercial world is said to function like a game of Monopoly, where the board represents the jurisdiction of commerce and statutory law.[1] Every time an individual signs a document—such as a mortgage, loan application, or utility bill—they are technically providing the "credit energy" that powers the transaction.[1]

Entities like banks and utility companies are viewed as "Nominees" who capture this signature value to generate wealth.[1] These nominees pay taxes on that value to the U.S. Treasury, which acts as the "Bankruptcy Trustee" for the global commercial board.[1] Bibi Bacus makes a sharp distinction between a "signature," which is tied to the strawman under the UCC, and an "autograph," which belongs to the real, flesh-and-blood person.[1] She claims that every time a person signs a credit card or court paper, funds are being discharged from their birth certificate trust fund through deception and fraud.[1]

The SEDM Perspective: Proof of the Public Office

The extensive document titled 'StrawMan.pdf,' revision 9-23-2017, published by the Sovereignty Education and Defence Ministry (SEDM), provide a detailed legal and theological argument for the existence of the strawman.[1] SEDM explicitly identifies the strawman as a "public office" within the government.[1]

Presidential Admission as Foundational Evidence

The document cites President Obama's farewell address, given on January 10, 2017, as evidence that "Citizen" is in fact a "public office".[1] Exhibit #01.018 in the SEDM collection highlights this "admission" as proof that the status of citizen is a public office and is the only lawful subject of civil legislation or civil enforcement.[1] The text argues that the "citizen" mentioned in this context is a statutory citizen, distinct from a constitutional or state citizen.[1] Filling this office is argued to be entirely voluntary.[1]

The Thirteenth Amendment and Involuntary Servitude

A central argument in the SEDM framework is the requirement of consent.[1] If filling the public office of the strawman were not voluntary, it would constitute involuntary servitude and a violation of the Thirteenth Amendment.[1] To "unvolunteer," an individual must remove themselves from a domicile on federal territory to become a statutory "non-resident non-person" in relation to the national government.[1] The document

asserts that government cannot lawfully impose duties upon private parties or use, benefit from, or tax private property without the owner's consent.[1]

Biblical Origins and Agency

The SEDM analysis posits that God and the Bible are the origin of the "strawman" concept.[1] Like everything that is perceived as an abuse by government, it is argued to be a counterfeit of God's design.[1] In the Bible, Jesus introduced himself by saying he was "in the Father" and "the Father in Him," which is interpreted as an indication of agency.[1] This agency is the equivalent of a "strawman" from a legal perspective.[1] Jesus acted as an agent of a Sovereign God and not of his own authority or free will.[1]

In legal terminology, a "divine agent" of God's law is called an officer or agent under the law of agency.[1] Under man's law, that agency can only lawfully be exercised and enforced after the express consent of both the principal and the agent.[1] Without mutual express consent and the fulfilment of basic elements of a valid contract, any claimed agency is unenforceable.[1] If the duties of such agency are enforced against those who never expressly consented, it results in a criminal tort, identity theft, and slavery.[1]

Distinguishing Public and Private Domains

The document emphasizes a strict legal distinction between "Public" and "Private" property and ownership.[1] It posits that the state can only tax or regulate what it creates; since the state did not create men or women, it can only regulate "persons" (the strawman) which it did create.[1] This legal theory asserts that the purpose of de jure government is the protection of exclusively private rights and the "right to be left alone".[1]

Statutory Domain	**Constitutional Domain**
Statutory Citizen (Public Office)	**Constitutional Citizen** (National)
Domicile on Federal Territory	**Nationality in a State**
Public Rights / Privileges	**Private / Unalienable Rights**
Subject to Civil Statutes	**Protected by Bill of Rights**

Consent via Domicile/Franchise	**Self-Executing Protection**
Government as Master	**People as Sovereigns**

Bibi Bacus and the Global Judicial Banking System

Bibi Bacus provides a distinct narrative regarding the international monetization of identity and the role of the judiciary as a "banking" system.[1]

Judges as Cashiers and Bankers

Bacus asserts that modern courts are not "courts of law" but operate under "colour of law," which she describes as fictional and lawless.[1] She claims there are no actual judges; instead, they are individuals "doing business" as judges and essentially act as "bankers" or "cashiers".[1] According to Bacus, whenever papers are signed in court, the judge is paid out of the individual's "60 QV Trust" tied to the birth certificate.[1]

specialized Training and Corporate Agency

Bacus alleges that federal judges in America are appointed and sent to special schools in Scottsdale, Arizona, and Reno, Nevada, to learn how to apply "fraud contract" law in the courtroom.[1] She argues that the majority of judges in the UK, Canada, and Malawi are retired lawyers "doing business" as judges under the Uniform Commercial Code rather than actual law.[1] This system is characterized as a "trap" where individuals unknowingly enter into contracts because they are ignorant of the UCC and contract law, allowing corporations to manipulate them.[1]

The UCC as the Only Law

The Bacus narrative maintains that society is not under any actual law, but only "contract law" under the UCC.[1] She claims that signatures are tied to the "fiction" or strawman and are used by banks to "monetize" the individual's trust fund.[1] To avoid being held liable for these contracts, she suggests there are special ways to sign documents "without responsibility" or "without prejudice" to preserve common law rights.[1]

The Jurisdictional Trap of Agency Between Natural and Artificial Persons

ECCLESIA LAW

Ecclesia Law explains the relationship between the living man and the birth certificate construct as a "jurisdictional trap" through several doctrinal and structural mechanics.[1] Agency is the "conceptual bridge" that allows the state to bind the living man to the liabilities of the artificial construct.[1]

Presumed Agency and the Nexus of Conduct

Because an artificial person is intangible and "breathless," it cannot act in the material world on its own and requires a natural representative to effectuate its will.[1] The "Agency Trap" occurs when the system presumes that the living individual corresponding to the birth record is the agent and surety for that artificial entity.[1] This trap is often sprung through presumption rather than informed consent.[1]

Every time a living individual uses the name on a birth certificate, presents a driver's license (which is state property), or answers to the name in court without qualification, they are deemed by their conduct to have consented to the agency relationship.[1] By using these "player pieces," the living man represents to the state that he has the authority to act for the construct, thereby binding himself to its liabilities.[1]

The Inversion of the Salomon Principle

In standard corporate law, established in the case of *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*, the "corporate veil" was designed to protect natural persons from the liabilities of an artificial entity.[1] However, in the birth certificate construct, this principle is inverted.[1] The state uses the separation of personality to create a liability-bearing entity and then uses the Law of Agency to attach those liabilities back to the living man as the presumed surety.[1]

The living individual fails in court because they fail to distinguish between identifying as the entity and acting for the entity.[1] By identifying as the artificial person (the player piece), the living man allows the state to bypass the corporate veil and access his energy and labour directly to satisfy the liabilities of the construct.[1]

The Directing Mind and Will Doctrine

Under the "directing mind and will" doctrine, articulated in *Tesco Supermarkets Ltd v Nattrass*, the mental state of the agent is attributed to the corporation or artificial person.[1] If the living man (the agent) acts with mens rea or a "guilty mind," that state is attributed to the artificial person.[1] This justifies the imposition of penalties on the artificial entity, which the living man, as the presumed surety, is then required to pay.[1]

Agency Component	Standard Legal Rule	Inverted Agency Trap
Separation	Company is a different person than members.	Birth record is a different person than the child.

Liability	Veil protects natural person from entity debts.	Agency attaches entity liabilities to living man.
Authority	Principal bound only by authorized acts of agent.	Man bound by state-owned persona via conduct.
Capacity	Personal vs. Representative clearly defined.	Presumed surety capacity for natural man.
Attribution	Acts of "directing mind" attributed to entity.	Man's guilty mind used to penalize the entity.

Why the Strawman Theory is Fundamentally Flawed

Despite its intricate internal logic and widespread belief within certain communities, the strawman theory is recognized by courts and legal scholars as fundamentally flawed, often labelled as "pseudo-law" or a "scam".[2]

The Meads v. Meads Decision and the OPCA Label

In 2012, Associate Chief Justice John D. Rooke of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta addressed the strawman theory in detail in his *Meads v. Meads* decision.[2] The 736-paragraph judgment compiled over a decade of Canadian jurisprudence and American research to refute what it termed "Organized Pseudo-legal Commercial Arguments" (OPCA).[9] Meads had purported to name the case management justice his fiduciary, imposed a scheme of fines on those using his name, and detailed a contract between his natural self and his all-caps persona.[9]

Rooke ACJ concluded that "Double/split person" schemes have no legal effect and no basis in law.[2] He famously observed that a human person is also a legal person and is liable for the laws of the state.[10] The court found that these arguments are peddled by "charlatans" purporting to assist people, but the result is exploitation.[10] Rooke noted that the applicant's own writings described the persona as an "artificial person" or "legal fiction," which even if it existed, would not be capable of performing the acts that attract criminal liability.[11]

Fatal Category Errors and Jurisdictional Realities

Academic critiques emphasize that sovereign citizen movements fail because they commit a "fatal category error".[1] They attempt to argue factual, biological reality (the living man) in statutory courts designed solely to adjudicate the administration of commercial agency.[1] Engaging with the court to deny jurisdiction without severing the presumed agency often inadvertently validates the very relationship the individual is trying to deny.[1]

The authority of courts and government agencies does not come from a literal contract but from state sovereignty, which allows an independent state to govern its political affairs within its borders.[11] The belief that "silence means agreement"—meaning a contract with the government stands until rescinded—is a misunderstanding of social contract theory, which is a philosophical argument for the state's authority, not a commercial transaction.[11]

The Absence of Secret Accounts and Hidden Credits

The core claim that hidden bank accounts exist at the Treasury is considered absurd and unsupported by evidence.[7] There is no credible record of the Federal Reserve or IRS trading birth certificates on the stock market.[2] The "redemption" procedures promoted by advocates are seen as fraudulent schemes aiming to avoid taxes and eliminate debts through nonsensical documents.[5] The FBI considers those promoting these theories likely fraudsters, and the IRS fines people who claim them on tax returns.[2]

Societal and Institutional Harms

Activities of sovereign citizens in court cause significant harm, including the wasteful use of court and police resources and the erosion of confidence in the justice system.[13] These litigants are often very litigious, increasing judgment times by up to 50 percent in some instances.[14] This behaviour has a darker side, with physical and death threats being made against senior judicial officers, some of whom have contemplated quitting because of the stress and disruption.[14]

Playing Monopoly to Win: The Technically Sound Solution

The "Monopoly" solution is an advanced commercial strategy that conceptualizes the global legal and financial landscape as a highly structured "game board".[1] Unlike simple denials of jurisdiction, this framework seeks to reclaim control over the artificial persona by mastering the administrative rules of the game.[1]

The Envoy Protocol and the Office of General Executor

The foundational step in this Monopoly solution is the "Envoy Protocol," which involves transitioning an individual's legal status from a "Presumed Agent" or "Debtor" to the **General Executor** of the birth certificate estate.[1]

- **Transitioning Capacity:** Standard commercial perception views an individual as a "Presumed Agent" or "Subject/Citizen".[1] The Envoy Protocol shifts this to "Principal/General Executor" and "Banker/Master of the Board".[1]
- **Rebutting Presumptions:** The state presumes the living man to be lost at sea or incompetent, probating the estate in his absence.[1] The individual must provide public notice of their competence "Nunc Pro Tunc" (now for then) to formalize their role as the chief administrator.[1]

- **Writ of Prohibition:** By occupying this office, the individual aims to prevent administrative overreach by the state.[1] The General Executor can issue a "Writ of Prohibition" to stop judges or public officials from performing administrative acts regarding the estate.[1] Any unauthorized act by a state official is then categorized as "Executor De Son Tort"—an executor by his own wrong.[1]

The Currency Creation Protocol and 1099-OID Recoupment

This protocol addresses the "Rules of the Board" regarding the state of perpetual bankruptcy that allegedly began in 1933 following the suspension of the gold standard via HJR 192.[1]

- **Money of Account vs. Substance:** Because real money (gold) was removed, debts can no longer be "paid," only "discharged" using debt instruments like Federal Reserve Notes.[1] This creates a system where the people are the creditors (whose property collateralizes the national debt) and the government is the debtor.[1]
- **The Role of the Holder in Due Course:** The protocol involves establishing a private fiduciary on the board acting as the "Holder in Due Course" (HDC) under the Uniform Commercial Code.[1] An HDC is someone who takes a negotiable instrument for value, in good faith, and without notice of defects.[1]
- **Recoupment Mechanics:** When an individual signs documents like mortgages or utility bills, they provide the "credit energy" that powers the transaction.[1] The strategy uses **IRS Form 1099-OID (Original Issue Discount)** to file corrective tax filings to recoup these credits that were previously paid by other nominees to the Treasury.[1]

The Asset Fortress Protocol and Private Treasury Operations

The "Asset Fortress Protocol" establishes a trust-held treasury and asset-holding structure to reduce personal commercial exposure.[15]

- **Structural Framework:** It establishes a private grantor trust under ecclesiastical authority to perform two core functions: private treasury operations and asset holding.[15] All money flows through trust-held accounts administered by fiduciaries, rather than personal accounts where enforcement can happen directly against the individual.[15]
- **Separation of Roles:** The protocol separates the roles of the Trust (holds legal title), the Trustee (the birth certificate persona for required compliance), and the Beneficiary (the living soul who receives support).[15] This separation ensures that income, assets, spending, and liability are not sitting in one estate, which gives the system leverage.[15]
- **Third-Party Settlement:** Obligations are handled through administration and payment under trust authority where applicable, prioritizing documentation and administration over confrontation.[15]

Protocol Component	Standard Litigation Approach	Advanced Monopoly Warfare
Capacity	"I am a man, no contract" (Belligerent)	General Executor / Banker (Master)
Strategy	Argue factual biological reality.	Reclaim administrative control of the office.
Jurisdiction	Deny the court's authority.	Assert superior probate jurisdiction.
Mechanism	Rescission via non-consent.	Rebut presumptions Nunc Pro Tunc.
Liability	Deny the existence of debt.	Discharge debt via credit recoupment.
Goal	Separation from the Strawman.	Mastery of the Strawman as a tool.

Practical Procedures for Status Correction

For those committed to the belief system, specific steps are recommended to terminate the strawman and correct one's status within the system's own records.[1]

Social Security Withdrawal and the Form SSA-521

The withdrawal of a Social Security Number is a primary method of "unvolunteering" from the strawman office.[1]

1. **Request for Withdrawal:** The individual completes two copies of Form SSA-521 and submits them to a Social Security office.[1] If the SSA approves the request, the original application will have no legal effect, but the individual forfeits all attached rights and must return any payments received.[1]
2. **Official Recording:** The individual creates an "Affidavit" of the withdrawal and records it at the County Recorder's office to establish a certified true copy.[1]
3. **Notice of Law:** A copy of the recorded documents is sent to the Secretary of State or the head of the Social Security Department via Registered Mail.[1] Proponents claim that if these recordings remain unrebutted for 30 days, they "become law".[1]

Administrative Termination via UCC and EIN

The "Straw Man Forms Processing" protocol involves administrative filings intended to return the identity to the government while maintaining full use of it for contracting.[1]

- **UCC-1 and UCC-3:** Individuals file one UCC-1 Financing Statement and two UCC-3 documents with their Secretary of State.[1] This is intended to terminate the strawman identity represented in all-capital letters.[1]
- **Obtaining an EIN:** The individual faxes an IRS form to obtain an Employer Identification Number (EIN) for themselves, theoretically creating a new private fiduciary identification separate from the government-owned strawman.[1]

Defensive Responses to Levies and Jurisdiction

If the IRS attempts to levy wages after status correction, proponents advise writing to the employer to clarify that the individual is not a statutory "taxpayer" but a "Non-filer".[1] The employer is instructed to hold wages in an escrow account rather than forwarding them to the IRS, based on the argument that the employer is a private-sector organization not connected to the government.[1]

Challenging the authority of IRS agents is another common tactic.[1] Individuals are advised to ask the agent to verify their basis for the Notice of Levy and provide an "agent's Power of Authority affidavit".[1] If the agent cannot provide written authority, the individual asserts that the tax is not truly owed and that the agent is acting without jurisdiction.[1]

Summary and Conclusions

The strawman theory is a multifaceted belief system that seeks to address a genuine legal phenomenon—the distinction between natural and artificial persons—using a combination of conspiratorial narrative, theological agency, and administrative master-strategies.[1] While legal experts and courts have uniformly

rejected the theory as fundamentally flawed and a "scam," its prevalence persists due to a widespread desire to resist perceived government overreach and the complexities of the modern administrative state.[2]

The "Monopoly" framework represents a strategic evolution within this community.[1] It acknowledges that the living man woman fails in statutory courts because those forums are ontologically restricted to the administration of commercial agency.[1] By shifting the individual's capacity from a presumed debtor to a master administrator (General Executor), the Monopoly strategy provides a technically sound solution from the perspective of its practitioners—it accepts the "game board" but changes the individual's role from a pawn to a master player.[1] Success in this arena, however, remains elusive within the conventional legal system, as courts continue to assert that a human person is also a legal person, and no unilateral filing of paperwork or creation of trusts can exempt an individual from the overarching sovereignty of the state.[2]

Works cited

1. THE BIGGEST SECRET PLAYING MONOPOLY TO WIN .pdf
2. Strawman theory - Wikipedia, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strawman_theory
3. What do judicial officers need to know about sovereign citizens?, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/judicial_officers/sovereign_citizens_need_to_know.html
4. Common-Sense Responses to Radical Practices: Stifling Sovereign Citizens in Connecticut Note, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1319&context=law_review
5. Sovereign citizen movement - Wikipedia, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sovereign_citizen_movement
6. What Sovereign Citizens Believe - Program on Extremism | The George Washington University, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://extremism.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs5746/files/downloads/JMB%20Sovereign%20Citizens.pdf
7. Sovereign Citizens: An Introduction for Law Enforcement - Public Intelligence, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://info.publicintelligence.net/FBI-SovereignCitizens.pdf
8. ELI5: What is a strawman/strawman theory? : r/explainlikeimfive - Reddit, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/explainlikeimfive/comments/2r2gzm/eli5_what_is_a_strawmanstrawman_theory/

9. View of After the Hammer: Six Years of Meads v. Meads - Alberta Law Review, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://albertalawreview.com/index.php/ALR/article/view/2548/2515
10. Case Note - Straw Man argument fails - Murray Torcetti Lawyers, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://murraytorcetti.com.au/case-note-straw-man-argument-fails/
11. The Misconceptions of Pseudolegal Preachers - Part 2: Baseless Legal Arguments, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://www.sydneycriminallawyers.com.au/blog/the-misconceptions-of-pseudolegal-preachers-part-2-baseless-legal-arguments/
12. Simon Goldberg and Empower the People: selling US tax fraud, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/2026/02/25/simon-goldberg-empower-the-people-tax-fraud/
13. Sovereign citizens: ideology, impacts and judicial responses, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/judicial_officers/sovereign_citizens.html
14. Sovereign citizens and the law: the impact of pseudo law on the legal system, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://lsj.com.au/articles/sovereign-citizens-and-the-law-the-impact-of-pseudo-law-on-the-legal-system/
15. Asset Fortress Protocol, accessed on March 3, 2026, https://assetfortressprotocol.com/